

REMARKS

Applicant's counsel thanks the Examiner for the Interview conducted today, March 16, 2010. The Interview focused on U.S. Patent No. 6,751,446 to Kim et al. (Kim). For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner agreed that Kim in combination with Mizuta et al. (US 2003/0064758) (Mizuta), U.S. Patent No. 6,359,984 to Kim, U.S. Patent No. 6,993,366 to Kim or Babasaki (U.S. 2002/0198017) did not render the pending claims obvious.

Kim fails to expressly disclose "a first speaker provided at one end of a front face of and in a longitudinal direction of said first housing and a second speaker provided at the other end of the front face of and in a longitudinal direction of said first housing" as required, for example, by claim 1. Rather, Kim merely discloses that the second speaker could be "fitted . . . [on] the front or sides of the body 1." Hence, Kim does not expressly disclose that the first and second speakers should or even could be longitudinally positioned on the front face of the Kim device. In fact, such a configuration would be impossible in the device disclosed in Kim as shown in Fig. 1. In Fig. 1 of Kim, a microphone 5 is located opposite the first speaker 6 and the second speaker 11 is located on the back or rear side of the device 1 to minimize interference between the speakers and microphone. No person of ordinary skill in the art would position the second speaker 11 adjacent the microphone 5 because of the interference that would occur between speaker 11 and microphone, rendering the device useless. Moreover, there would be no logical benefit to locating the speakers 6 and 11 on the front face of the Kim device 1 unlike the claimed device. Accordingly, because Kim does not expressly disclose the claimed configuration, and indeed the claimed configuration would render the Kim device unusable due to interference, Kim may not be relied upon to render the pending claims obvious.

As noted in the Examiner's Interview Summary of today:

Examiner Dean agreed with Mr. Garces on the fact that the Kim references does not teach the feature of "a first speaker provided at one end of a front face of and in a longitudinal direction of said first housing and a second speaker provided at the other end of the front face and in a longitudinal direction of said first housing". Examiner Dean agreed that this particular configuration would not be possible in Kim due to the interference issues between the speaker and the microphone. Examiner Dean indicated to Mr. Garces that when the response to the outstanding office action is received Examiner Dean will then reopen prosecution and issue either an allowance or a non final office action if any other prior art surfaces due to another search.

For the foregoing reasons, and for the reasons articulated in Applicant's prior response, which is incorporated herein, Applicant respectfully submits claims 1-17 are now allowable over the cited prior art. Payment of the appropriate fees, if any, and/or granting of the appropriate extension is requested, and the Commissioner is directed to debit our deposit account, Account No. 50-0675, Order No. 848075/0060, for the amounts required.

Respectfully submitted,


John C. Garces
Reg. No. 40,616
Schulte Roth & Zabel, LLP
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Tel.: (212) 756-2215

Date: March 16, 2010